## For the Northern District of California

| 1      |  |   |
|--------|--|---|
| 2      |  |   |
| 3      |  |   |
| 4      |  |   |
| 5      |  |   |
| 6      | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |   |
| 7<br>8 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |   |
| 9      | SALMA MERRITT, ET AL,  | No. C 13-01391 JSW                              |
| 10     | Plaintiff,   | ORDER DIRECTING PROPOSED                        |
| 11     | v.   | AMICUS TO RE-NOTICE<br>MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE |
| 12     | KEVIN E. MCKENNEY, ET AL,  |   |
| 13     | Defendant.   |   |
| 14     |  | <u></u>   |
| 15     | On July 31, 2013, Dr. Karin Huffer filed a motion for leave to file an amicus brief in this      |   |
| 16     | case. Dr. Huffer noticed that motion for a hearing on August 30, 2013, when the Court is set to  |   |
| 17     | hear other motions in this case. However, under the Northern District Local Rules a party must   |   |
| 18     | notice a motion for hearing not less than 35 days from the date the motion was filed and served. |   |
| 19     | See N.D. Civ. L.R. 7-2(a). Dr. Huffer's motion does not comply with Local Rule 7-2(a).           |   |
| 20     | Accordingly, Dr. Huffer shall re-notice the motion for a hearing on an open and                  |   |
| 21     | available date on this Court's law and motion calendar. However, the briefing scheduled that     |   |
| 22     | has been triggered by the filing of the motion remains unchanged. If Dr. Huffer seeks to         |   |
| 23     | have the motion heard on shortened time, she may file an application to that effect and explain  |   |
| 24     | the reasons why the motion should be heard on shortened time. See N.D. Civ. L.Rs. 6-1, 7-1.      |   |
| 25     | IT IS SO ODDEDED   |   |

Dated: August 1, 2013

26

27

28

JEFFRE STATES DISTRICT JUDGE